DAVID R. OBEY, WISCONSIN, CHAIRMAN

JOHN P. MURTHA, PENNSYLVANIA NORMAN D. DICKS, WASHINGTON ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, WEST VIRGINIA MARCY KAPTUR, OHIO PETER J. VISCI OSKY INDIANA NITA M. LOWEY, NEW YORK JOSÉ E. SERRANO, NEW YORK ROSA L. DELAURO, CONNECTICUT JAMES P. MORAN, VIRGINIA JAMES P. MOHAN, VIHGINIA JOHN W. OLVER, MASSACHUSETTS ED PASTOR, ARIZONA DAVID E. PRICE, NORTH CAROLINA CHET EDWARDS, TEXAS
PATRICK J. KENNEDY, RHODE ISLAND
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, NEW YORK LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, CALIFORNIA SAM FARR, CALIFORNIA
JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., ILLINOIS
CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, MICHIGAN CHAKA FATTAH, PENNSYLVANIA STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, NEW JERSEY SANFORD D. RISHOP, IR. GEORGIA MARION BERRY, ARKANSAS BARBARA LEE, CALIFORNIA ADAM SCHIFF, CALIFORNIA MICHAEL HONDA, CALIFORNIA BETTY McCOLLUM, MINNESOTA STEVE ISRAEL, NEW YORK TIM RYAN OHIO TIM NYAN, UHIO
C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, MARYLAND
BEN CHANDLER, KENTUCKY
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, FLORIDA CIRO RODRIGUEZ, TEXAS LINCOLN DAVIS, TENNESSEE JOHN T. SALAZAR, COLORADO

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations Washington, DC 20515-6015

December 17, 2009

JERRY LEWIS, CALIFORNIA
C. W. BILL YOUNG, FLORIDA
HAROLD ROGERS, KENTUCKY
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
JACK KINGSTON, GEORGIA
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, NEW JERSEY
TODD TIAHRT, KANSAS
ZACH WAMP, TENNESSEE
TOM LATHAM, IOWA
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, ALABAMA
JO ANN EMERSON, MISSOURI
KAY GRANGER, TEXAS
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, IDAHO
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, TEXAS
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, IDAHO
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, TEXAS
MARK STEVEN KIRK, LILINOIS
ANDER CRENSHAW, FLORIDA
DENNIS R. REHBERG, MONTANA
JOHN R. CARTER, TEXAS
RODNEY ALEXANDER, LOUISIANA
KEN CALVERT, CALIFORNIA
JO BONNER, ALABAMA
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, OHIO
TOM COLE, OKLAHOMA

CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR BEVERLY PHETO

> TELEPHONE: (202) 225-2771

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As you prepare to attend the U.N. climate change conference in Copenhagen, we caution you against pursuing environmental policies that will undermine job creation in our already fragile economy. We are particularly concerned about efforts to address climate change that circumvent the legislative process, are not grounded unequivocally in sound science, and don't reflect majority public opinion in the United States. Recent events suggest that this is precisely the course your Administration is pursuing with regard to greenhouse gas policy. History has shown us that such policies are unsustainable and often have unintended negative consequences.

While we support efforts to protect the environment, we are deeply concerned that the Administration is pushing through sweeping environmental policy reforms without regard for the impact they are having on the economy. Businesses have made it clear that they cannot afford to invest in job creation with burdensome, expensive regulations hanging in the balance. According to a January 2009 survey by the Pew Research Center, the economy and jobs overwhelmingly rank as the first and second priorities of Americans. With one in ten Americans presently unemployed, these numbers are hardly surprising.

We acknowledge that you share with us and the American people the anxiety over high levels of unemployment and a fragile economy. However, we note with concern the comments by several Administration officials in recent days that the scientific evidence for man-made climate change is "overwhelming" and that "that vast majority" of scientists agree that climate change is man-made. A majority of Americans, including a divided Congress, are not convinced. In October 2009, the Pew Research Center estimated that only 36 percent of Americans believe there is solid evidence of man-made global warming.

December 17, 2009 The President Page Two

It is absolutely essential that climate change policy be based on sound science. Our legislative and regulatory actions at the federal level can only be as credible as the research upon which our work is based. The narrow margin of support for cap-and-trade legislation in the House, and the demonstrated lack of support for cap-and-trade legislation in the Senate, suggests that lawmakers share our concern about the lack of credible science. And yet, with the EPA's endangerment finding announcement this week, it appears that your Administration has decided to circumvent the legislative process altogether to advance preconceived notions relating to climate change.

Further, we also remain concerned about recently raised questions relating to several prominent climate scientists and the likelihood that their efforts to suppress or eliminate data and to manipulate the peer-review process have improperly influenced the conclusions contained in landmark reports by the U.S. Global Change Research Program, the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and others. Both the recent regulatory actions (endangerment finding) by the EPA and cap-and-trade legislation currently being debated in Congress have relied heavily on the legitimacy and conclusions drawn by those reports.

As the U.N. announced its own review of this "serious" matter last Friday, so too should your Administration. It is apparent that the EPA's recent actions, as well as cap-and-trade legislation approved by the narrowest of margins in the House, may have been based upon false pretenses. The very legitimacy of the information upon which these actions were taken has been called into question. It is clear that the outcome of the House vote on the cap-and-trade proposal may well have been different had this information surfaced prior to the bill's consideration.

The recently enacted fiscal year 2010 budgets for a number of science agencies contain significant increases for climate change activities. For example, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill alone includes \$382 million for climate change, an increase of \$155 million over the FY 2009 level. While we do not question the fundamental need for sound scientific research on climate change, we have consistently questioned the rationale for such a large and rapid escalation of spending. We have also questioned the amount of redundancy and the level of coordination of climate change related research and scientific activity across the federal government.

To date, the extent to which these funds are focused on achieving highest-priority scientific objectives has been poorly communicated if not poorly defined. Nevertheless, we believe legitimate questions about the credibility of scientific information presents a potential game-changing moment in the climate change debate. This is an occurrence that could not have been foreseen when the FY2010 budget was presented and debated in Congress. As members of the House Appropriations Committee, we believe that a timely and thorough review is both necessary and prudent.

December 17, 2009 The President Page Three

Therefore, we urge you in the strongest possible terms to re-direct funds necessary, using a portion of enacted fiscal year 2010 climate change funding, to determine the full extent to which illegitimate scientific evidence and research has been used to support recent legislative and regulatory actions (including the recently passed cap-and-trade legislation in the House and this week's EPA endangerment finding). In an attempt to set politics aside, we ask that a credible, independent entity conduct this review and report to the Congress and the American public within 90 days. Should reprogramming limitations require your Administration to request approval from Congress in order to fund such an investigation, we will support it. The absence of a clear and transparent review will lead many to conclude that cap-and-trade legislation and recent regulatory actions by the EPA are based not on sound science but on politics as usual in Washington, DC. We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely

Ranking Member

House Appropriations Committee

Mike Simpson Ranking Member

Interior and Environment Subcommittee